

**DRAFT**

Serial No. 08/902,331

$$0.4 \frac{r_{13}}{\min} \leq \frac{1}{0.7} d_o \leq \frac{r_{13}}{\max} \quad (7)$$

and

$$0.4 \frac{r_1}{1.4} \cdot .07 \leq d_o \leq 0.7 \cdot \frac{r_1}{1.3} \quad (8)$$

Hence,

$$0.2 r_1 \leq d_o \leq 0.54 r_1 \quad (9)$$

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend claim 36 as follows:

Line 1, after "The" insert --circular target--.

Please amend claim 37 as follows:

Line 1, after "The" insert --circular--.

Line 2, change "the" (first occurrence) to --a--.

Please amend claim 44 as follows:

**DRAFT**

Serial No. 08/902,331

44. (Amended) Circular target body, comprising a cylinder-body with a central opening, one end face of said body being symmetrically concavely tapered towards the axis of said cylindrical body through said opening to thereby define a new atomization surface in the form of a concave, substantially bell-shaped sputtering surface, [viewed in a cross-sectional plane along said axis by steadily bent lines,] a backside of said body being formed by a flat annular outer ring-surface and an inwardly recessed flat circular center surface, an amount of taper  $d_0$  being defined by

$$0.2 r_1 \leq d_0 \leq 0.54 r_1$$

wherein  $r_1$  is the radius of said cylindrical body.

#### REMARKS

With regard to the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, applicants would point out that the amendment changing " $d_0$ " to " $-d_1-$ " was done to correct an obvious typographical mistake and to conform the claim language to the disclosure. That is, the disclosure does not use " $d_0$ " to describe any target body parameter. Instead " $d_1$ " is used to designate the peripheral thickness of the target body. In this connection, the Examiner's